

REMARKS

Applicant has canceled claims 1, 6, and 7 for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution. The cancellation of claim 1 has necessitated rewriting into independent form claims 2, 3, and 8, which depend from claim 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 2-5, 8, and 9 will be pending and under examination. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claim 1 for anticipation, relying on Faqih, U.S. Patent 6,684,648 (Faqih). See the Office Action, page 2, lines 7-12. Applicant has canceled this claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 6 and 7 for obviousness, relying on Faqih and “Engineering Design Choice.” See the Office Action, page 2, line 21 through page 3, line 2. Applicant has also canceled these two claims.

Of note, the Examiner does not provide in the Office Action the full citation of “Engineering Design Choice.” Neither does he include this reference in the Notice of References Cited attached to the Office Action. For a complete record, Applicant requests that the Examiner provide the full citation of this reference and also include it in the “References Cited” section in the patent issued from this application.

Allowable subject matter

The Examiner acknowledges that claims 2-5, 8, and 9 cover allowable subject matter, but objects to these claims on the grounds that they depend from a rejected base claim. See the Office Action, page 3, lines 4-6.

Applicant has rewritten claims 2, 3, and 8 in independent form. These claims therefore do not depend from a rejected base claim. Nor do claims 4 and 5, dependent from claim 3, and claim 9, dependent from claim 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the rejections asserted by the Examiner have been overcome and claims 2-5, 8, and 9, as pending, are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges to Deposit Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 66301-002US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11-13-07

Y. Rocky Tsao
Y. Rocky Tsao, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,053

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2503
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499